

8



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,336	01/16/2001	Uri Zemik	SFTO0002	7527

22862 7590 12/10/2003

GLENN PATENT GROUP
 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
 MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER

JOSEPH, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/10/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/764,336

Applicant(s)

ZERNIK ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas J Joseph

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 8 and 10 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham (US 6,647,534) and Hsu et al. (US 6,574,644).

Claim 1,11 and 12:

Graham teaches a method, system with a processor for presenting a search result, and a computer program product embodied on a computer readable medium (fig. 6, #602). All software program products are embodied on computer readable media. Graham teaches determining categories for finding information by analyzing the content of the information (fig. 6, #602). Graham teaches displaying images that correspond to the categories (col. 3, lines 5 – 20).

Graham fails to teach correlating the categories with images that represent the categories. Hsu teaches correlating the categories with images that represent the categories (fig. 8). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of combine correlating the categories with images that represent the categories taught by Hsu with the technology for analyzing the content of information disclosed by Graham. Doing so enables the user to incorporate images with text when processing document displays.

Claim 2:

Graham teaches images corresponding to the information being displayed when a user activates one of the categories (col. 3, lines 5 – 20). The thumbnails suggest information associated with categories.

Claim 3:

Graham teaches presenting a search result wherein the user activates one of the categories by dragging a cursor over the image that corresponds to the category (fig. 7a, #740).

Claim 4:

Graham teaches displaying a grid (fig. 7a). The display screen is a type of grid.

Claim 5:

Graham teaches information including a plurality of web sites (col. 45 – 55). The URLs referred to by Graham suggests a plurality of websites.

Claim 6:

Graham fails to teach providing a rotating display of content from the websites. Hsu teaches providing a rotating display of content from the websites (fig. 8). The overlapping window suggests overlapping rotating displaying of website contents. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine providing a rotating display of content from the websites taught by Hsu with display system disclosed by Graham. Doing so enables the user to quickly access various available items.

Claim 7:

Graham teaches providing a video display of content from the website (fig. 7a).

Claim 8:

Graham fails to teach including rotating each web site according to whether the web site includes image content that is relevant to textual content on the website. Hsu teaches including rotating each web site according to whether the web site includes image content that is relevant to textual content on the website (fig. 8). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine including rotating each web site according to whether the web site includes image content that is relevant to textual content on the website taught by Hsu with display system disclosed by Graham. Doing so enables the user to quickly access various available items using a system of organization.

Claim 10:

Graham teaches dynamically displaying content from the websites including showing representative images from the website that correspond to textual content in the website (fig. 7a, #708).

Claim 13 and 20:

Graham teaches a method and a computer program product embodied on a computer readable medium (fig. 7a). Graham teaches software that requires a program product embodied on a computer readable medium. Graham teaches analyzing textual content of the information (col. 2, lines 45 – 55). Graham teaches associating the textual content with image content (fig. 7d). Graham teaches displaying the image content to illustrate the information (fig. 7d, #708).

Graham fails to teach configuring to analyze textual content of the information and associate the textual content with image content. Hsu teaches a processor configured to analyze textual content of the information and associate the textual content with image content (fig. 8). Hsu teaches a displaying the image content to illustrate the information (fig. 8). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of combine configuring to analyze textual content of the information and associate the textual content with image content taught by Hsu with the technology for analyzing the content of information disclosed by Graham. Doing so enables the user to incorporate images with text when processing document displays.

Claim 14:

Hsu teaches image content being included in the information (fig. 8).

Claim 15:

Graham teaches image content not being included in the information (fig. 7a).

Claim 16:

Hsu teaches metadata associated with the image content being associated with the image content being correlated with the textual content to determine the image content that is associated with the textual content (fig. 8).

Claim 17:

Graham teaches information including a website (fig. 7a).

Claim 18:

Graham fails to teach reading tags associated with a website wherein creating for the tags indicate that material associated with the tags is representative material. Hsu

Art Unit: 2174

teaches reading tags associated with a website wherein creating for the tags indicate that material associated with the tags is representative material (fig. 2; col. 2, lines 60 - 65). Hsu teaches displaying associated with the tags being representative material (fig. 2; col. 2, lines 60 - 65). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of combine teach reading tags associated with a website wherein creating for the tags indicate that material associated with the tags is representative material. Hsu teaches reading tags associated with a website wherein creating for the tags indicate that material associated with the tags is representative material taught by Hsu with the technology for analyzing the content of information disclosed by Graham. Doing so enables the user to establish image links with text documents when processing document information.

Claim 19:

Graham teaches displaying the representative material as a representative material response to a search request (fig. 7a).

Claim 21:

Graham and Hsu teach the rationale of claim 21 in rejected claims 20.

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham (US 6,647,534) and Hsu et al. (US 6,574,644) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Headrick et al (US 6,535,889).

Claim 9:

Graham and Hsu fail to teach information including information stored on a DVD. Headrick teaches information including information stored on a DVD (col. 8, lines 61 – 65). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine information including information stored on a DVD taught by Headrick with the information and document processing system disclosed by Graham and Hsu. Doing so provides a removable, non-volatile medium for storing data.

Response to Arguments

4. The Applicant responds to the restriction of the previous office action by electing group 1 corresponding to claims 1 – 21 without traverse.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J Joseph whose telephone number is 703-305-3917. The examiner can normally be reached Mondays through Fridays from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

November 29, 2003

tjj



Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100